UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-----------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/957,451 | 09/21/2001 | Marc O. Schurr | 06530.0276-00000 | 2507 |
| | 7590 02/06/200 ENDERSON, FARAE | EXAMINER | | |
| LLP | ŕ | EREZO, DARWIN P | | |
| 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 3773 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 02/06/2009 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | | |
|-----------------|---------------|--|--|
| 09/957,451 | SCHURR ET AL. | | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | | |
| Darwin P. Erezo | 3773 | | |

| | Darwin P. Erezo | 3773 | |
|--|---|---|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the o | correspondence add | ress |
| THE REPLY FILED <u>09 January 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A | | - | |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperfor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: | the same day as filing a Notice of a replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi real (with appeal fee) in compliance | Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or | hich places the (3) a Request |
| a) The period for reply expires <u>4</u> months from the mailing date | of the final rejection. | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(the content of the co | dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth hter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE | g date of the final rejection | n. |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi | of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic | ate extension fee e action; or (2) as |
| The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of the | |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b | out prior to the date of filing a brief | will not be entered be | Called |
| (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor | | | cause |
| (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below | | , , | |
| (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or | | ducing or simplifying th | ne issues for |
| (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c | corresponding number of finally reje | ected claims. | |
| NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). | | | |
| The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | | mpliant Amendment (I | PTOL-324). |
| 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). | | timely filed amendmer | t canceling the |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | l be entered and an ex | xplanation of |
| Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>see continuation sheet</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | |
| 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appear and was not earlier presented. Se | al and/or appellant fails see 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1) | s to provide a |
| 10. | n of the status of the claims after e | ntry is below or attache | ed. |
| The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> | does NOT place the application ir | condition for allowand | ce because: |
| 12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other: | PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) | | |
| | /Darwin P. Erezo/ Primary Examiner, Art U | Init 3773 | |
| | | | |

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims rejected are 1,2,5,7,120,121,124,126,127,129-132,134,135,137,138,140,142-145,147,148,150-155,157,164-167 and 172-181.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because the applicant's arguments are still not persuasive.

The applicant maintains the argument that one would not find it obvious to modify the device of Le Roy to be made of bioabsorbable material. However, as previously stated by the examiner, Le Roy discloses various functions for the clip device, which includes use with scalp and back wounds (as stated by the applicant) but also injuries that are located within the body. This is evident in col. 3, II. 9-15, in which the clip may incorporate x-ray or radiopaque material so that the clip may be located if it should be "lost" within the operative site. A clip used exclusively in external surfaces of the patient will not require such disclosure. Therefore, the clip of Le Roy may be used as an external or internal clip, and it would be obvious to modify the clip to be formed of a bioabsorbable material if used as an internal clip.

Furthermore, hemostatic clips are well known to be used internally for closing internal wounds, as evidenced by US 4,246,903 to Larkin.